

THE
SUCCESSION

10. La

2

OF THE

House of *Hannover*

VINDICATED,

AGAINST

The PRETENDER'S

Second DECLARATION in Folio,
intituled, *The Hereditary Right of the*
Crown of England asserted, &c.

Ad Populum Phaleras, ego te intus, & in
Cute novi.

Written by Mr. ASGILL.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. ROBERTS at the Oxford-
Arms in Warwick-Lane. M.DCC.XIV.

(Price One Shilling.)

H

SUCCESSION

OF THE

Pl. 1



THE BRITISH MUSEUM

AND THE ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

OF GREAT BRITAIN

AND IRELAND

AND THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

OF GREAT BRITAIN

AND IRELAND

AND THE ROYAL AFRICAN SOCIETY

OF GREAT BRITAIN

AND IRELAND

AND THE ROYAL HINDOOSTANIC SOCIETY

OF GREAT BRITAIN

AND IRELAND

AND THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

OF GREAT BRITAIN

AND IRELAND

*The Succession of the House of
Hannover vindicated, &c.*

*Rel
Duty*

ABOUT this time Twelvemonth (as I remember, be the same more or less) there came out two anonymous Pamphlets :

The one intituled, *Jus Sacrum* ;
And the other, *Memoirs of the Chevalier*
St. George.

From which, in conjunction, I then took liberty to publish the *Pretender's Declaration*, according to the Rules and Maxims therein prescrib'd for him.

Now by another late Anonymous in Folio, I find the two former were but the Jackal, giving notice that the Lion was coming.

I remember then a Rumour, that they were rumaging hard for the Will of King *Henry the Eighth*.

And lo! now they have found it! as a holy Relique, reserv'd from Ages and Generations past, to be reveal'd just at this time, when they think they have so pat an occasion for it.

But the Finders demanding twelve Shillings a head for the sight of it, I have pirated it at twelve Pence :

For which, I am advis'd, the Author cannot have his Law against me, without setting his Name to his Folio.

Which if he had, perhaps he was conscious of some Law against him, for High Treason (or thereabouts) in libelling the Settlements of the Crown by Parliament.

For tho he is so wise, in his tenth Page, as not to dispute himself the Power of the Parliament, in limiting the Inheritance of the Crown ;

Yet he is so cunning to spend the rest of his Pages, in offering such Reasons, as he hath, to persuade every one else, both to dispute and deny that Power.

(Not much unlike a Man or two, I know, who are themselves very zealous for the Succession of the House of *Hannover*, but hate every one else that is so.)

But as Children use to keep their Plumbs to the last, so our Author (after all his Preliminary Reasons) hath kept the Will of King *Henry* the Eighth as a Stone in his Sleeve, for the Pin-Basket or Clencher to all the rest.

And with this he seems to hug himself, as having caught the Kingdom in a *Dilemma* (*Anglice*, a Why-not.)

For, saith he, King *Henry* the Eighth having a Power by Parliament to limit the Succession

cession of the Crown (upon failure of his own Issue) did, by his Will, limit the same away from the Heirs of his elder Sister, Queen of Scotland, to the Heirs of his younger Sister, Queen of France (by her second Husband, Charles Brandon Duke of Suffolk.)

And yet, saith he, you know that the Crown hath been ever since held and enjoy'd by King James the First, and his Descendants, as Heirs to the Queen of Scotland.

This is what he saith.

From whence he would have his Readers think (for as for himself, he professes to deal only in matters of Fact) either that the Parliamentary Limitation then made of the Crown to the Heirs of the younger Sister, was void against the Heirs of the elder; or else that King James the First, and his Descendants, have been Usurpers only, against that Limitation.

And our Author hath descended so far into this matter, as to name the Earls of Derby, the Descendants of the Queen of France.

Now, thinks our Author, no one dares be so hardy, as to arraign her Majesty's Title to the Crown, by setting up the Earls of Derby as Competitors:

Ergo (thinks he again) the Revolution-Men must knock under Table, and give up the present Settlements of the Crown, as void against the next Heirs.

And

And then our Author, and his Folks, know, (or think they know) what they have to do next.

Now (tho I have a personal Honour for the Earl of *Derby*) I intirely fall in with our Author's Fancy, that neither the Earls of *Derby*, or any other of her Majesty's Subjects, have thoughts of them as her Competitors, under the Will of *Henry* the Eighth.

And yet I'll wrestle a Fall with our Author, before I give him his Conclusion ;

That therefore the Parliamentary Settlements of the Crown were, or are, either void or illegal.

And tho I have, as yet, the Laws of the Kingdom on my side, to give our Author a shorter Conviction :

Yet because we Authors, are to fence fair with Pen, Ink, and Paper only, I freely wave all carnal Weapons ;

And as Prize-Fighters shake hands before they go to Blows ;

I'll make all just Acknowledgments of the Author (tho unknown) before I attack his Treatise.

First, I do believe that what he hath done was not of his own head, but that the hand of *Joab* is in all this.

Secondly, I do acknowledg he hath given to his Treatise a Title antient, grave and laudable, talking about *Hereditary Right* ; and after

after that, he hath adorn'd it with the Stile of an Orator, the Language of a Gentleman, and an Air of Temper, with marginal Notes and Quotations of antient things, and all other Commodities and Appurtenances belonging to a Twelve-Shilling Folio.

But after all this, I don't repent my Motto, in allusion to the Treatise it self;

Ad Populum Phaleras.

Something like a Horse, and not a Horse, in Horse-Trappings.

And as it was the Saying of a Reverend Divine, *Whenever I fight, I care not whether I have any Weapon in my own hand, provided my Antagonist hath one:*

So I feel my self a little encourag'd to this Encounter, that tho I my self am unarm'd (not having access to *Biblioth. Harley.* and other Libraries, quoted by our Author, out of which he seems to have been furnish'd) yet if I miss not my aim, I shall either wrest his own Weapons from him, or turn the Points upon him.

OUR

OUR Author seems to publish his Treatise, in confutation of *Dr. Higden's View of the English Constitution.*

From whence our Author states the Question to be, *Whether Inheritance or Possession is, by the Constitution, the Right to the English Monarchy :*

And immediately danceth into the distinction of Kings *de facto*, and Kings *de jure*, fram'd by the House of York against the House of Lancaster.

'Tis true (saith our Author) the Doctor acknowledgeth in plain Terms, *That the Crown is Hereditary ;*

But then, saith he, the Doctor also asserts, *That this Inheritance may be limited by Parliament :*

Which our Author promiseth not to dispute. (No ; *Tace* is Latin for a Candle.)

But in the same Paragraph, he would have it seem both incoherent and ridiculous, *That this Inheritance should be limited by Parliament ;*

And hath made his whole Treatise a Libel upon any such Parliamentary Settlements.

He saith, the Generality of all Men understand, by an Hereditary Right, *A Monarchy entail'd on one Family, and descending successively*

cessively to the several Heirs of it ; such as the Monarchies of France, Spain, Portugal, &c. and all other Hereditary Dominions of the World. And such, saith he, is the English Monarchy govern'd successively above nine hundred years by the same Royal Family ; which, he saith, hath the advantage for Antiquity above any in the World.

Remark. ' Now being a little prone to ' Contradiction, I do deny that the Monarchy of *France* is always descendible to the next Heir, according to the understanding of Heirs in our Law (which I conceive is the Sense our Author means in his Position :) for the Inheritance of the Crown of *France* is qualify'd by the *Salick* Law, as they call it, to prevent the Crown from descending to any Female, tho next in Blood.

' And in such case the Crown is to go to the next Male of the Royal Family, whether lineal or collateral ; who cannot properly be call'd the Heir, because the Female, as next in Blood, is Heir at Common Law.

' And therefore the Crown, in that case, doth not come to that Male by Descent, according to Common Law, but by a special Law of that Kingdom. Therefore if our Author would have the Monarchy of *England* to be model'd by that of *France*, he must introduce the *Salick* Law ; by which, I say, the Crown would not be always descendible to the next in Blood, according to

‘ our Author’s Definition of Hereditary Right.
 ‘ And so our Author hath stumbled at the
 ‘ Threshold.’

AND our Author, in further contradiction to his first Position, and to shew us that this Lineal Descent is not always to take place, hath quoted several Instances, wherein the same hath been interrupted, and that for just Reasons.

1. By a Disposition of the Crown by the present Regnant from the next Heir.

2. By a Cession or Submission of the next Heir himself.

Remark. ‘ Why then, before I go any farther, I’ll take our Author at his word, *That this Inheritance is not indefeazible :*

‘ For which I thank him, as the first of his Order that ever I found so desperate as to part with that Adjective.

‘ And I call it desperate, because that being yielded, the Contest is at an end.

‘ That the Crown of *England* is hereditary in the Royal Family, and descendible from one of them to another, unless that Descent be prevented, I as freely own as our Author can assert.

‘ But that this Descent may be lawfully prevented, by Translation of the Crown from
 ‘ the

the next Heir apparent, to some other of the same Royal Family, is as essential a part of the Constitution as the other; and our Author hath so acknowledg'd it.

' And had he ended his Treatise here, I had never begun mine.

' But he having gone out of his way (to serve a present Turn) as soon as that is over, he eats his words, and would have his dear *Indefeazible* again: which he shall not, if I can help it; or at least, as I find him apostatizing, I'll give him a gentle Jog now and then.'

YOU must know that Dr. *Higden's* General Position (as our Author tells us) is,

That the People of England submitted to the thirteen Kings, who, from the Conquest to King Henry the Seventh, came to the Throne, without Hereditary Right; as well as to the six Hereditary Kings, who reign'd in that Period.

Remark. ' Now our Author having hung out his Title-Page, as a Sign of shewing the Constitution of the Monarchy to be Hereditary, he thought, perhaps, if he admitted thirteen in nineteen in that Constitution to be Non-Hereditary, it would be a Prescription of a general Rule, with fewer In-

stances for it, than there are Exceptions against it.

Therefore our Author's first Stratagem, is to get from the Doctor so many of his thirteen Non-Hereditary Kings, as will make the Author's six Hereditary Kings to be the Majority.

And this he hath done, by converting four of the Doctor's thirteen Non-Hereditary into Hereditary Kings; which added to our Author's six Hereditary, makes them ten; and then the Doctor hath but nine, and our Author hath the Majority:

And so *Captus, Capta, Captum*;

The Doctor's overcome in Arithmetick.

But to gain this Victory, our Author is forc'd to suspend his Adjective *Indefeazible*, without which he could not work this Conversion of Non-Hereditary into Hereditary Kings; as will appear by the Sequel.

OUR Author tells us, that the Doctor, by *Hereditary Kings*, means only such as held the Crown by Proximity of Blood; and by *Non-Hereditary*, such as plac'd themselves in the Throne, when others, nearer related by Descent, were living.

But, saith our Author, the Doctor should have known, that *Hereditary* had a different signi-

signification, in antient writing, than he hath assign'd to it.

For, saith our Author, tho *William* the Conqueror was not the next of kin to *Edward* the Confessor, yet he well maintain'd himself to be King *Edward's* Heir, and to have the Title of the Crown Hereditary to him by King *Edward's* Will.

And our Author saith, a Successor by Will is an Heir, in the Language of the Civil Law :

And saith, that many of the Doctor's Friends have taken it ill, that the word *Hereditary* should be appropriated only to such as succeeded by Proximity of Blood.

Remark. ' Now whether the Doctor and I are Friends or no, I can't tell ;

' But in this Point I court our Author's Friendship, by intirely agreeing with him, ' *That Hereditary Title is not confin'd to Proximity of Blood only.*

AND to push it farther, our Author saith, it is a Truth never call'd in question, that many of our Kings, since the Conquest, were generally esteem'd rightful Successors, tho they were not the next Heirs by Blood to the Crown.

Remark. ' Nor ever shall be call'd in question by me,'

AND

AND then our Author begins to catechize the Doctor, *Whether in this Hereditary Monarchy of England, there was not antiently a Power in the Crown to interrupt and limit the Lineal Succession, by the Exclusion of the Right Heir?*

Remark. ' I can't answer for the Doctor :
' But giving our Author the Question (at present) *That the Kings of England had this Power*, I may ask him another, *Whether, a fortiori, the Kings and Queens, with their Parliaments, have not the same Power still?*
' And if not, how they came to lose it ?

THEN our Author interrogates the Doctor again, *Whether the Consent and Cession of the next rightful Heir, is not sufficient to convey the Right to a Prince, who wanted a Title by Proximity of Blood?*

Remark. ' Why then, if the Crown be any way transferable from the next Heir Apparent, the Descent of it cannot be *indefeazible*, or necessary.'

THEN

THEN our Author (taking these his *Postulata's* for granted) further demands of the Doctor, *Whether it is not possible that the general Obedience paid to several of the thirteen Kings, call'd by the Doctor Non-Hereditary, might not be so paid them as Kings Hereditary, tho not by Proximity in Blood?*

For the Doctor, saith he, makes no question, *but that it hath been the undoubted Right of our modern Kings, with Consent of Parliament, to interrupt the Lineal Succession, by Exclusion of the right Heir; and so universally admitted in the Reigns of Henry the Eighth, and Queen Elizabeth.*

Now, saith our Author, *I look upon this as a good Ground of Presumption, that their Predecessors had the same Authority.*

And as an Instance of this, he quotes the Predecessors of the Kings, who, by their last Wills, usually dispos'd the Crown from the next in Blood to it,

Remark. ' But methinks to argue, Because
' the Kings may do it by Consent of Parlia-
' ment, that therefore they may do it without,
' is to make the Parliament of *Great Britain*
' a Parliament of *Paris*; which is, I presume,
' what our Author, &c. are driving at.'

BUT

BUT from these general Propositions, our Author descends to particular Instances, how Kings of *England*, not Hereditary by Proximity of Blood, yet became so by other means.

And begins his Calendar with *William* Duke of *Normandy* (whom he calls, *The Conqueror*) and affirms him *a lawful King, because King Edward the Confessor, the Saxon King, had appointed him for his Successor.*

For the Truth of this, he quotes *Gul. Pictaviensis* (one of the Conqueror's Chaplains.)

And yet, in the precedent Page, he saith, that this same Chaplain tells us, That upon the Conqueror's Landing, King *Harold* (who had seiz'd the Crown on the Death of King *Edward*) sent a Messenger to the Conqueror, *That King Edward had bequeath'd the Crown to Harold.*

From whence, saith our Author, it is evident, that the Dispute between them was not about the Validity of the Donation, but which of the Donations should have the Precedency.

Remark. ' And from whence I think it is
' also as evident, how precarious and peril-
' lous it is for Kings or Subjects to admit the
' Crown to be alienable by the Will or Do-
' nation of the last Regnant, if it were for no
' other

other reason than the multiplying Competitors ; who would not likely submit their Pretences to Probates in *Doctors-Commons*, or Trials in *Westminster-Hall* ; but in the open Field, where these Competitors decided their Claims with the Blood of *Harold*, and 70000 Subjects slain on his side.'

AND our Author, to justify this Donation of *Edward* the Confessor to the Duke of *Normandy*, saith, It was no inconsiderate Act, nor the sole effect of his own Will, being ratify'd by the express Assent of the Nobility and People of *England*, and notify'd to the Duke in a particular Embassy for that purpose ; so that it must be look'd upon as a Publick Act of the whole Kingdom.

And he saith, that the Conqueror having this Title, appeal'd to the Laws of *England*, for deciding the Quarrel between him and *Harold*.

Remark. ' And good reason he had for it, as our Author hath related it. And why then have not all his Successors, on whom the Crown is confer'd by the King, Nobility and Commons, as good Right to the same, whether such Successor be next in Proximity of Blood, or not ?

C

NAY,

NA Y, and more than all this, our Author doth admit that King *Edward* himself, who made this Donation of the Crown, had no Right to it by Proximity of Blood; the Issue of *Edmund Ironside* (the late King, and his elder Brother) being then living.

And notwithstanding his want of Proximity in Blood, our Author retains his Assertion, That this *Edward* the Confessor had not only a just Hereditary Right to the Crown, but had also a Right to translate the same from the Issue of his elder Brother (who were next in Blood) to *William* Duke of *Normandy*.

Remark. ‘ And yet this *William* Duke of
 ‘ *Normandy* (had he been Legitimate at home)
 ‘ was not of the Royal Blood to the Crown
 ‘ of *England*, nor had any possibility to in-
 ‘ herit the same by Descent; having no other
 ‘ Relation to the *Saxon* Kings, than an Affi-
 ‘ nity by the Marriage of *Emma* his Aunt,
 ‘ whom King *Ethelred* took for his second
 ‘ Wife, by whom he had *Edward* the Con-
 ‘ fessor.

‘ Upon which I would graft a Question:
 ‘ If the Crown be lawfully transfera-
 ‘ ble from the Royal Family to a Stranger
 ‘ in Blood; is it not an Argument, *à fortiori*,
 ‘ that the same Crown may be lawfully tran-
 ‘ slated

‘ flated from one Branch of the ſame Royal
 ‘ Family to another?’

BUT that our Author’s Readers may not be at a loſs to know how *Edward* the Confefſor had an Hereditary Right without Proximity of Blood, our Author hath reveal’d (or invented) a Secret, which perhaps may prove as great a Rarity as the Will of King *Henry* the Eighth.

You muſt know, that upon the Death of King *Ethelred* (Father of *Edward* the Confefſor) there were two Claims put in for the Crown; the one by *Edmund Ironſide*, Son of *Ethelred* by his firſt Queen; and the other by *Canutus* (Son of *Swayne* King of *Denmark*.)

And after ſeveral Battels, to prevent ſhedding more Blood, it was agreed to decide the Conteſt by a ſingle Duel, between *Edmund* and *Canutus*.

And to prevent that, it was afterwards agreed, that the Kingdom ſhould be divided between them; or (as others ſay) the Duel was fought, and that *Canutus* finding himſelf wounded or overmatch’d, demanded a Parly, and thereby obtain’d the Partition, which was ſo held during their joint Lives.

And *Edmund* dying firſt (leaving Iſſue *Edward* and *Edmund*) *Canutus* claim’d the whole

by Survivorship, on pretence that the Partition was not to go to the Issue of either.

And sent *Edmund's* Sons to his Brother (King of *Denmark*) to be murder'd; but his Brother abhorring the Fact, and to preserve them, sent them to the King of *Hungary*, where young *Edmund* died, and *Edward* marry'd the Queen of *Hungary's* Sister, by whom he had Issue *Edgar Atheling*.

And *Canutus* having marry'd *Emma* (King *Ethelred's* second Queen) Mother to *Edward* the Confessor, she, to secure him from *Canutus*, sent him to her Brother the Duke of *Normandy*, where he retir'd into a Convent, and so was call'd the Confessor.

On the Death of *Canutus*, *Edward* return'd to *England*, and was elected King, notwithstanding his Nephew *Edward*, and *Edgar* his Son, were before him in Blood.

And having reign'd twenty years, without Issue by his Queen (Daughter of *Godwin* Earl of *Kent*) he sent to *Hungary* for his Nephew *Edward* and his Son, intending them for his Successors.

Edward, soon after his Arrival, died, leaving young *Edgar*, then next in Blood to the Crown.

Now, saith our Author, tho *Edward* the Confessor did come to the Crown without an Hereditary Right (his Brother's Issue being before him in Blood:)

Yet, saith he, *Edward* took the Crown, with an intent to preserve it for his Brother's Issue; and therefore taking it with an Hereditary Intention, for the use of another, he thereby gain'd an Hereditary Right to it for the use of himself, and so was an Hereditary King (if I collect right our Author's Reasoning.)

And he prescribes this Hereditary Intention as an universal Salvo for the wounded Consciences of any Possessors of a Crown, who hold the same with such Hereditary Intention, altho they are not next in Blood to it.

And tells us in what Cases this Salvo is properly to be apply'd :

As when (saith he) the present Regnant, for want of Power and Opportunity of doing Right to the lawful Heir, is forc'd to endure the Burden of a Crown, which he would gladly ease himself of upon a proper occasion.

Remark. ('Then it seems there are occasional Regnants, as well as occasional Consonants.') (Note: The original text contains a typo 'Confor-' which has been corrected to 'Consonants' based on context.)

As when (saith our Author) the rightful Heir is abroad in a different Kingdom, and perhaps at the disposal of a foreign Prince, on whose Will and Pleasure his Return to his Country depends.

Remark. 'As suppose now (for example) in *France* or *Lorain* (as a Man may say.)'

Now,

Now, saith our Author, when the Possessor of a Throne hath this to plead for himself (which he saith was the Case of *Edward the Confessor*, for any thing that can be alledg'd to the contrary) then our Author appeals to the most censorious Judges, whether such a Person be only a King *de facto*; for our Author lays it down as a Maxim in Government, *That 'tis the Intent that makes the Usurpation.*

Remark. ' Now to speak well of the Dead, ' it seems to me (from the History) that ' King *Edward the Confessor* did send for his ' Brother's Issue, with intent they should be ' his Successors.

' But by the same History it also seems to ' me, that he did not declare this Intention, ' till after twenty years of matrimonial Experience, without Success of Issue.

' And as burdensom as the Crown sat upon him, it seems, by the History, that he ' did not intend his Nephews should ease him ' of it, till he could hold it no longer.

' Now whether this Intention of Right, ' being only in Reversion after his Death, did ' purge his Disseizin by wrong (if it were so) ' during his Life, I must submit to such nice ' Casuists as our Author.'

AND

AND after all, it seems this Hereditary Intention was never executed by him; for instead of leaving the Crown to his Nephews, he left it to *William* Duke of *Normandy*, as our Author saith.

For which our Author gives this as the Reason; That Prince *Edward* the Nephew dying, leaving *Edgar Atheling* his Son young; and King *Edward* perceiving *Edgar* unqualify'd for the Crown (as well by the Infirmities of his Mind as Body) enter'd into an Alliance with *William* Duke of *Normandy*, and made it his Business to secure the Crown to him, as best able to defend it against *Harold* (Son of Earl *Godwin*) who aspir'd after it.

Remark. ' Then it seems, that in case of
' an Incapacity in the Heir Apparent to the
' Crown, it is lawful to translate it to some o-
' ther more capable, according to the Law of
' *Thanestry, Detur Digniori.*'

BUT our Author fighting cunning, would not allow this neither (if he could help it;) for, saith he, I don't mention this as if the Qualities of *Edgar*, how mean soever, could

could destroy his Hereditary Right, but only to shew, that these were esteem'd good and sufficient Reasons to keep him out of the Throne.

Remark. ' Well with all my heart ! Take it
' so then, that tho the Hereditary Right to
' the Crown remain'd in *Edgar*, yet it was
' no wrong to keep him out of it, and never
' let him come into it.

' And so it seems that *Edward* the Confessor,
' and *William* Duke of *Normandy*, did Prince
' *Edgar* no wrong ; for they only translated
' the Crown and Crown-Lands, with the
' Appurtenances, from him, but left the Right
' thereof still to remain in him ; (an innocent
' sort of Novel-Disseisin.)

BUT our Author won't let it rest here
neither.

What, saith he, if I should add, that *Edgar* himself was sensible it was his Interest to decline the possession of the Crown, and therefore comply'd with his Uncle's Settlement of it ?

Remark. ' Why let him add it if he will,
' but let him let me add this to it ; That then
' this *Edgar* was one of the first Fops that ever
' thought himself so, and was naturally endow'd
' with a knowledg, which one of the
' best

best and wisest of Princes pray'd for ; Lord,
 ' *teach me to know my Errors.*

' And as great a Milk-sop as our Author
 ' would make this young Prince, the Histories
 ' stile him, in his own day, *The Darling of*
 ' *the English Nation.*

' And as much as he declin'd the Crown,
 ' he was declar'd King by the *Saxon* Nobility,
 ' and headed their Armies in two Battels a-
 ' gainst King *William.*

' But 'tis true (as our Author tells us)
 ' that *Edgar* was beat (a standing Argu-
 ' ment of Folly !)

AND this poor Prince must not rest here
 neither.

What, saith our Author, if it should ap-
 pear that this *Edgar* had not so good a Title as
 is pretended, but that King *Edward* the Con-
 fessor himself was all along the true Proprie-
 tor of the Crown he enjoy'd, and might dis-
 pose of it as he pleas'd ? I hope then, saith
 our Author, there was no wrong done to *Ed-*
gar, by calling the Duke of *Normandy* to the
 Succession.

Remark. ' I don't say there was ; but then,
 ' I say, our Author hath done wrong both to
 ' Prince *Edgar*, and also to his Readers, by
 ' not telling this at first : for if it be, as he
 D ' saith

‘ faith, he might have left *Edgar* out of the
‘ Case, without abusing him in his Grave, as
‘ he hath done.’

NOW see how he brings this about :
He tells us, as the Truth is, that *Edgar*’s Claim was from *Edmund Ironside* his Grandfather, elder Brother to *Edward* the Confessor.

And that *Edmund* having been reduc’d to Extremities, did, by Advice of his People, consent to a Partition-Treaty, before mention’d, whereby the whole Kingdom was divided between him and *Canutus* (the Danish King.)

And that *Canutus* surviving *Edmund*, the Nobility and Bishops declar’d upon Oath, that *Canutus* was intitled to the whole ; and they took their Oaths to him, without any regard to the Sons of *Edmund*, whom they deny’d to be their Kings.

And from thence our Author is positive, that *Edgar Atheling* had no just Pretensions to the Crown of *England*.

Remark. ‘ Some Pages before our Author
‘ asserted the Hereditary Right of the Crown
‘ always to have remain’d in *Edgar*.

‘ But now, it seems, that Right gave him
‘ no Pretensions to claim it.

‘ By

‘ By which he hath explain’d his Title-
 ‘ Page, *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of*
 ‘ *England asserted, to be a Right without a*
 ‘ *Remedy.*’

AND our Author hath found another Title for *Edward the Confessor* still :

He saith that *Hardicanute*, the next precedent King to *Edward the Confessor* (being his Half-Brother by Queen *Emma*) appointed him his Heir and Successor ; by which Donation, King *Edward* had a Title to dispose of the Crown.

Remark. ‘ And I never heard of King or Subject with so many Titles as this King *Edward* (unless he were a *Spaniard*.)

YET our Author would not have this King *Edward* think, that he hath taken all this pains in respect to him only, he being one of the nineteen Kings in our Author’s Calendar.

But having assum’d to prove the Constitution of the Monarchy to be *Hereditary* only, our Author thought it would look like a Blot in the Scutcheon, to let the first Instance

in the Calendar go for a Non-Hereditary King.

And yet having no way to get the Conqueror from the Doctor's thirteen, but by the Donation of *Edward* the Confessor, our Author hath taken all this Pains to wash King *Edward* clean first.

To do which, he hath accumulated Title upon him, which perhaps King *Edward* himself never thought of.

And so in truth he hath for *William* the Conqueror; who, tho he might make the Donation of King *Edward* a Pretence to initiate himself to the Throne; yet he is said, on his Death-Bed, to own his Accession to the Crown not to any Right of Inheritance, but by the Instinct of God, and Fate of War.

AND our Author further, to clear the Conqueror from any wrong done *Edgar*, saith, The Conqueror only dispossessed *Harold*, who had no Right.

But that, after that, it could not be expected that he should place *Edgar* in the Throne whom the Subjects had before rejected.

Remark. ' And yet our Author would persuade as many of her Majesty's Subjects as he can, to accept a Person they have abjur'd

THEN our Author saith, he having done thus much for *William* the Conqueror, he'll do as much for his Son *William Rufus* his Successor, tho he were but his second Son.

And this he doth in a trice, taking it for granted that the Kings had power to name their Successors :

For that the Conqueror nam'd his Son *William* for his Successor to the Crown of *England*, our Author saith, cannot be controverted by those that are acquainted with the *English* History.

Remark. ' I am not so well acquainted as
' our Author with the History ; but I find
' some Observations upon it, That the Con-
' queror said he would not take upon him to
' dispose his Crown, but wish'd that his Son
' *William* might enjoy it : and *William* first
' coming, had it, and held it against *Robert*
' his elder Brother, and his Issue (for he had
' a Son.)

' Nor am I calling the Title of *William* the
' Second in question :

' But desire our Author to remember, that
' this Succession of *William* the Second was
' another Translation of the Crown, from
' the next in Blood, to another of the Royal
' Family.'

AND

AND in affirmance of this Translation as just and legal, our Author saith himself, that tho *Robert* demanded the Crown by Inheritance as eldest Son, the *English* Subjects (who valu'd themselves upon their Fidelity) adher'd to *Rufus*, as having the better Title.

Remark. ' Ay! and I hope that (maugre
' all that our Author hath said, and others
' have done to the contrary) there are, and
' will be left of *English*, *Scotch*, and *Irish* Sub-
' jects, more than 500000 Men, who have
' not bow'd the Knee to *Baal*; and who va-
' luing themselves upon their Oaths and Alle-
' giance to her Majesty and the *Hannover* Suc-
' cession, will assert their Fidelity to the
' Crown, according to the present Settlements
' thereof in the Royal Family, against all Pre-
' tenders (either by Proximity of Blood, or
' without it.)

AND to clench the Crown in the *Norman* Line, our Author brings in the poor *Saxon* Prince *Edgar*, as resigning his Birthright again to *William Rufus*.

Remark.

Remark. ‘ And that was more than need,
 ‘ if our Author’s Law be right, That the
 ‘ first Resignation of *Edgar* to *William* the Fa-
 ‘ ther, had *ipso facto* transfer’d the Inheri-
 ‘ tance of it to the *Norman* Line.

AND thus our Author hath adjudg’d it
 again in his next Instance of King *Hen-*
ry the First.

Was not (saith he) *Robert*, the eldest Son,
 legally excluded, by his Father’s Gift of the
 Crown to *Rufus*?

And did not that justify *Henry*’s Claim af-
 ter *Rufus*?

And upon this our Author declares *Henry*
 the First, a King *de jure*.

For, saith our Author, must we suppose
 that the Conqueror, provok’d by *Robert*’s Re-
 bellion, and discerning him incapable for Go-
 vernment, intended only a short Suspension of
 his Right, to revive upon the Death of *Rufus*?

Remark. ‘ I trow not : but then let our Au-
 ‘ thor still remember, that Incapacities for Go-
 ‘ vernment are just Causes for translating the
 ‘ Crown from the next in Blood, to some o-
 ‘ ther of the Royal Family.

AND

AND our Author not only justifies the Title of *Henry* the First against his elder Brother (*Robert Duke of Normandy*) to the Crown of *England* :

But also commends it as a laudable Action in *Henry* the First (upon Complaint made to him by Duke *Robert's Norman* Subjects) to fetch him by force out of that Dukedom, and confine him in *England*, to his Death, as incapable of Government.

Remark. ' N. B. A Prince by Hereditary Birthright, lawfully deposed for Male-administration (*ipso Authore Judice.*)

KING *Stephen* standing next in the Calendar to *Henry* the First, our Author leaves him to the Doctor, as an errant King *de facto* only.

AND from him passeth to *Henry* the Second, whom he affirms to be a King *de jure*, tho the Empress *Maud* (his Mother, Daughter

Daughter and Heir to *Henry* the First) was then living, and before him in Blood to the *Norman* Line ; and altho the King of *Scotland* was then next in Blood to the *Saxon* Line, as descended from the Sister of *Edgar Atheling*.

Because our Author saith,

That the Empress resign'd her Right to *Henry* her Son :

And the House of *Scotland* did not claim the Crown, but allow'd *Henry* to be King.

AND thus our Author hath gain'd from the Doctor four of his thirteen Non-Hereditary Kings ; which added to the six before Hereditary, makes ten for our Author, and leaves the Doctor but nine of the nineteen.

And our Author having thus the Ascendant by Majority, he seems a little careless for any more.

And saith, he don't think himself oblig'd to follow the Doctor thro the whole List, since the Doctor hath not taken much notice of them himself.

However, King *John* standing next in his way, as one of the Doctor's thirteen, our Author seems to give him a Cast of his Office, towards making him *Hereditary*.

As if he had been appointed Successor by (the then last Regnant) *Richard* the First, his elder Brother :

Or that his Nephew *Arthur* (Son of *Jeffery*, his next elder Brother, being then next in Blood) had surrender'd to him.

But *Eleanor*, Sister of *Arthur*, being also living, our Author leaves this King *John* of the Doubtful Gender, whether *de facto* or *de jure*, and gives the Doctor a Licence to take him, if he pleaseth.

Remark. ‘ But if *Richard* the First could
 ‘ and did dispose the Crown from his Ne-
 ‘ phew *Arthur* to King *John*, and that *Arthur*
 ‘ also remitted to him; why should our Au-
 ‘ thor leave King *John* a more doubtful Title
 ‘ than he did to *William* the First, and his two
 ‘ younger Sons *William* and *Henry*, whom he
 ‘ hath made Hereditary Kings in the same
 ‘ manner?

‘ Therefore had not our Author made for
 ‘ himself the Majority before, and would have
 ‘ exerted his Faculty for King *John* also,
 ‘ question not but King *John* would have
 ‘ come out as rightful a King (in our Au-
 ‘ thor's former Sense of the Matter) as any of
 ‘ his Predecessors.

‘ But we Authors (like Poets or Painters
 ‘ draw our Patients, as we fancy, for the pre-
 ‘ sent Turn,

‘ By which it happens, *de mortuis*;

‘ Sometimes *nil nisi bonum*,

‘ And sometimes *nil nisi malum*.

FROM King *John* our Author makes a Transition to the House of *Lancaster*.

(By which, I conjecture, he hath skip'd over two more of the Doctor's thirteen.

First, *Henry* the Third, who continu'd the possession of the Throne against *Eleanor*, the then next in Blood to *Richard* the First.

Secondly, *Edward* the Third, who came to the Crown by the Deposition of his Father (*Edward* the Second.)

The first King of the House of *Lancaster* was *Henry* the Fourth (Son of *John* Duke of *Lancaster*) who came to the Crown by Deposition of *Richard* the Second; and after the Death of *Richard*, held the same against *Edmund Mortimer* Earl of *March*, Heir of *Philippa*, Daughter and Heir of *Lionel* Duke of *Clarence* (elder Brother to the Duke of *Lancaster*.)

And him our Author gives up to the Doctor, as an errant King *de facto* only.

AFTER this, he takes occasion (by the way) to answer the Doctor's Challenge, To name any *Non-Jurors* in the Reigns of *Kings de facto*.

To which our Author saith, That there were no such Tests then on foot (as there

have been since) to oblige the Subjects to any such Oaths.

Which if there had, our Author don't doubt but we had heard of many Non-Jurors against those *De-facto* Kings.

And for those that had taken Oaths to *Henry* the Fourth, our Author saith, they did not think themselves bound thereby, and so took Arms against him, he having first broken his Oaths to them.

Remark. ' Why then, it seems, the Breach
' of the King's Oath to the People, absolves
' them from their Allegiance to him.'

BUT our Author descending from *Henry* the Fourth to *Henry* the Fifth, doth confess, that after the Submission made to him by *Edmund* Earl of *March* (the then next in Blood to *Richard* the Second) *Henry* the Fifth had some foundation of Title to the Crown, during the Earl of *March's* Life.

Remark. ' But (if I don't very much forget)
' our Author did before affirm the Submission
' of *Edgar Atheling* to *William* the First, to
' have been a good Translation of the Crown
' from the *Saxon* to the *Norman* Line, not on-
' ly against *Edgar* himself, but his Sister Queen
' of *Scotland*, and all their Descendants.

' And (if I don't a little more forget) our
' Author also affirm'd in mighty strong Terms
' That the first Exclusion of *Robert* Duke of

' *Nor-*

Normandy from the Crown of England, by the Entry and Enjoyment of *William Rufus* his younger Brother, was a good Exclusion, not only of *Robert*, but of his Descendants also; and that *Henry the First*, his youngest Brother, had thereby a good Title against them.

And therefore had *William the Second* (or *Henry the First*) and *Henry the Fifth*, happen'd to have chang'd Places with one another in our Author's Calendar, they had had an equal Chance to have chang'd Titles too.

FROM *Henry the Fifth*, our Author descends to *Henry the Sixth* (his Son.) And here he begins to play the Casuist about taking and breaking of Oaths, in his management of the Contest between the Houses of *York* and *Lancaster*.

And hath left a Recipe for taking Oaths of State, which (being duly observ'd) can neither do the Subjects that take them any hurt, nor the Sovereigns, to whom they are sworn, any good.

Our Author confesseth that *Richard Duke of York*, and his Son (afterwards *Edward the Fourth*) (the Claimants of the Crown for the House of *York*, in right of the House of *Clarence*) had often solemnly taken Oaths of Allegiance to *Henry the Sixth* (of the House of *Lancaster*.)

Which,

Which, our Author saith, they ought not to have done, to have gain'd the World :

Yet, saith he, when the Oaths were taken, the *Spiritual Law* reliev'd them in the Non-observance of those Oaths, and the Pope actually granted them a Dispensation ; which, our Author saith, was then thought a sufficient Absolution.

Remark. ' And perhaps that Thought is not quite out of fashion yet.'

AND our Author saith further, That *Richard* Duke of *York* was not only this way absolv'd from his own Oaths, but that immediately upon his Claim of the Crown against *Henry* the Sixth, all the Subjects were *ipso facto* discharg'd of their Oaths to *Henry* the Sixth.

Remark. ' By which our Author hath admitted, that the Subjects are not bound by their Oaths to the present Regnant, any longer than he can maintain himself in the Possession of the Throne.'

BUT, saith our Author, perhaps it may be demanded, How it is possible for a right Heir to a Crown to resign his Title to it, if the Submission of *Richard* Duke of *York* (by swearing Allegiance to *Henry* the Sixth) was not a sufficient Resignation of the Crown?

To

To this our Author answers, *That a legal and effectual Resignation of the Crown can only be made before, and with the Concurrence of the three Estates of the Realm.*

Remark, ' And yet our Author hath not been pleas'd to tell us of any such Resignations by *Edgar Atheling* to *William* the First.

' But hath affirm'd, the personal Submission of *Edgar* by himself (tho that were but a Patience upon Force) to have been a good Resignation of his Right of the Crown to *William* the First.

' By which Remark, I am not offering my Opinion, *which of these two Contraries are right* :

' But can't help thinking, *That one of them must be wrong.*

' And indeed our Author hath been as liberal in multiplying Opinions to himself, as he did Titles to *Edward* the Confessor.'

OUR Author having follow'd these three *Henry's* of *Lancaster* out of the Saddle, by *Edward* the Fourth's mounting the Throne, he takes a good deal of pains to tell us what errant Usurpers these three *Henry's* were call'd, in Acts of Parliament of *Edward* the Fourth.

Tho I think our Author hath also told us, that *Henry* the Sixth (upon his temporary Re-
access

access to the Throne) retaliated the Language to the House of York.

Remark. ' And so they might have done to the end of the Chapter, upon the alternative Recess and Re-access of one another (if it had so happen'd;) but calling Names neither gives nor takes away Titles.'

AND our Author also is very elaborate, about telling us what Acts of Parliament of the three *Henry's* were confirm'd, and what others repeal'd by the Parliaments in *Edward* the Fourth:

And cites an Instance of a *National Debt contracted upon Parliament-Security, then in danger of being defeated, had not King Edward, by his Assent, intitled it to a legal Payment.*

Upon which he makes this shrewd Remark, *Perhaps (saith he) this was for carrying on a War against France.*

Remark. ' Not that the History (our Author quotes) tells him so ;

' But perhaps our Author is let into a Secret, for *paying the Publick Debts without Mony* (if his Card comes up Trump.)'

FROM *Edward* the Fourth, our Author passeth to *Richard* the Third, whom he leaves to the Doctor as a King *de facto* only.

But

But yet (our Author saith) that as to *Henry the Seventh* (his Successor) he was a King *de jure*, as every King *de facto* is to his Successor, who hath no better Title.

And therefore he saith, That *Henry the Seventh* took care to reverse such Acts of *Richard the Third*, as he had a mind to get rid of.

And then he tells us, That the Reason why the Acts of *Richard the Third*, and *Henry the Seventh* have still continu'd in force, is, for that *Henry the Eighth*, in respect to his Father *Henry the Seventh*, would not make him an Usurper, by repealing his Acts; and that none of his Successors have since given themselves the Trouble of calling them in question.

Remark. 'From whence several remarkable things do arise:

' *First*, That a Successor of a King, by repealing the Acts of his Predecessor, doth thereby make him an Usurper.

' *Secondly*, That all the Acts of *Richard the Third* and *Henry the Seventh* are still liable to be call'd in question, by any one that thinks them to his Disadvantage.

' Which would make a fine Gap in the Laws and Titles of the Kingdom.'

AND yet after all this, our Author saith,
That *Henry the Seventh*, from the time
of the Marriage of *Queen Elizabeth* (Heir of
F the

the House of York) undoubtedly became a King *de jure*.

Remark. ' The first and last Instance I ever
' heard of, where the Marriage of a Queen
' doth *ipso facto* make a Man a King, and a
' King *de jure* too.'

AND more than that, our Author saith,
That *Henry* the Seventh, from the first
entrance of his Reign, to his Marriage, might
be look'd upon as having a presumptive Right
to the Allegiance of the People, as he had ob-
lig'd himself to marry that Princess.

Remark. ' More Novelties still! But then,
' methinks, our Author hath left no Interval,
' in which he could call *Henry* the Seventh a
' King *de facto* only.'

AFTER this, our Author comes to wage
Law with the Doctor, upon the Sta-
tute of 11 *Hen.* 7. By which none are to be at-
tainted or forfeit for serving the King, for the
time being, in his Wars.

Which, he saith, the Doctor construes as
intended for a King *de facto*.

But our Author, it seems, would mean it
some other way :

And he saith, that *Henry* the Seventh pro-
cur'd this Act, lest *Perkin Warbeck* should have
beaten

beaten him, and hang'd up his Subjects for adhering to him.

And he saith, that if *Richard* the Third had but had such a Law for indemnifying them that fought for him, they could not possibly have been attainted by *Henry* the Seventh :

For that *Henry* the Seventh being at first but an Usurper, he could not have attainted his Predecessor (tho an Usurper) lest a third Usurper (*Perkin*) should have attainted him.

Which, our Author saith, *Perkin* could not have done, without violating the Laws he was bound by :

But yet he saith, that a King *de jure* would not have been bound by this Act.

Remark. ' Why then, it seems, that Usurpers only are bound by Laws; and Kings *de jure* at liberty to break them.'

AND now our Author tells his Readers, he is at liberty to release them from any farther Trouble, in answer to the Doctor, having so fully confuted him.

But saith, that the Doctor having gone a little out of the way, to assert the Right of the Legislative Power in limiting the Succession of the Crown, our Author will follow him, in examining some Historical Passages quoted by the Doctor.

But our Author (whether out of modesty or fear) *promiseth* to confine himself to mat-

ter of Fact, *without questioning the Power of Parliaments to limit the Succession.*

Remark. ‘ And I promise that I would have
‘ believ’d him, had not his whole *Folio* been
‘ one continu’d Question against that Power.’

AND by way of Preliminary, he saith,
That all that he shall observe upon Fact,
is, that whatever Power Kings, with their
Parliaments, may have *de jure*, upon such oc-
casions ; it is however true *in fact*, that no
Act of Limitation could yet effectually ex-
clude the next Heir by Proximity of Blood :
But that, sooner or later, *Providence* hath hi-
therto so order’d it, that those who were first
in the Line of Descent, have at length gain’d
the Crown, notwithstanding all Parliamenta-
ry Provisions to the contrary.

Remark. ‘ Or (to put our Author’s Princi-
‘ ples into fewer words) *The Parliaments may*
‘ *make such Acts if they please, but they signify*
‘ *nothing after they are made.*’

HE saith, he believes it will be allow’d
him, that we have no Laws extant of
this nature before *Henry the Fourth* ; by which
the Succession was settled upon his four Sons,
and their Heirs.

Remark. ‘ And yet while our Author was
‘ making Hereditary Kings, he made the
‘ Will

Will of the last Regnant to be a good Law, for effectually excluding the next Heirs by Blood, and all their Descendants, from inheriting the Crown, and for translating it upon others more remote; witness his Instances in *Edward* the Confessor, and the three first *Norman* Kings.

THEN our Author saith, the next Statute made in the Reign of *Henry* the Sixth, for entailing the Crown (in default of his Issue) on the Duke of *Clarence* (the younger Brother of *Edward* the Fourth) did not last long, being null'd by King *Edward* the Fourth's Accession to the Throne.

Remark. ' Nor did that Throne succeed to
' King *Edward*'s Sons, nor had ever probably
' return'd to his Daughter, without the Aid
' of *Henry* the Seventh, with the People of
' *England*.'

THEN our Author saith, That *Henry* the Seventh procur'd an Act for entailing the Crown on his Issue, for which our Author saith there was no occasion, for that they would have had the Right by their Mother.

Remark. ' But their Mother might have died
' without Issue, and *Henry* the Seventh have
' had other Issue, and then this Act had not
' been

‘ been impertinent ; and the Legislators, by
 ‘ the making of it, declar’d their Opinion,
 ‘ that they had power to do it.’

BUT our Author having laid these Instances as a Bridg or Train to his main Case of King *Henry* the Eighth, he passeth over to that.

King *Henry* the Eighth, in the 35th of his Reign, had an Act pass’d for establishing the Succession of the Crown, whereby (on failure of his own Issue) he was impower’d to limit the Succession of the Crown to whom he pleas’d, either by Letters Patent, or by his last Will sign’d by him.

Now our Author hath treated his Readers with Evidence of a Will made by King *Henry* the Eighth, whereby he limited that contingent Succession to the Heirs of his younger Sister, Queen Dowager of *France* (by *Charles Brandon* Duke of *Suffolk*, her second Husband.)

Notwithstanding which, our Author saith, That after the Death of Queen *Elizabeth* (the last Issue of *Henry* the Eighth) the Crown of *England* hath been held and enjoy’d by *James* the First, and his Descendants, as Heirs to the Queen of *Scotland*, eldest Sister of *Henry* the Eighth.

And from hence he would draw an inevitable Conclusion, That King *James* the First ascended

scended the Throne of *England*, directly contrary to the Order of Succession appointed by Act of Parliament.

And our Author saith, That by the Act of Recognition, 1 *Jac.* it is expressly said, That immediately upon the Death of Queen *Elizabeth*, the Crown did, by inherent Birthright, and lawful and undoubted Succession, descend and come to the said King *James*.

And this our Author saith was the original Contract.

Nor will our Author allow, that Queen *Mary*, or *Elizabeth*, had, or claim'd, any Title to the Crown by the Acts of Settlement, but were both of them legitimate, and inherited the Crown by that Right.

And after abundance of more Sayings of his own, and Quotations from others, he tells his Readers, That he hath presented them with Passages and Testimonies of the Laws, which clearly prove against Dr. *Higden*, That *Kings de facto were never consider'd, in our Constitution, as just and legal Proprietors of the Kingdom they possess'd.*

HAVING thus gone through the Law, he follows the Doctor into the Scriptures.

And first he would shew the Doctor to be of the Religion with *Shimei*, who curs'd *David*

vid (a King *de jure*) on presumption that *Absalom* would soon be King *de facto*.

Remark. ‘ And ’tis not much unlikely that
 ‘ our Author and his *Shimeites* would not
 ‘ spend their Anathemas so boldly against
 ‘ the Protestant Succession, if they had not
 ‘ some presumption of a Popish one.’

AND our Author would also resemble the Doctor to *Hushai*, who counterfeited a Desertion from *David* to *Absalom*, as likely to be then a King *de facto*; bringing this Saying with him, *Whom the Lord and this People chuse, his will I be.*

Remark. ‘ Tho *Hushai* said this in counterfeited to *Absalom*, he did it in sincerity to *David* (his Master.) Whether that be a Sin in a Privy Counsellor, I won’t assume to determine; but believe I may say, that the contrary is not a Duty.

‘ And as to the Saying it self, if our Author, and his Friends, don’t like it for Divinity, let them take the Reverse of it for their Motto, *Whom the Lord and this People reject, his will I be.*’

BUT our Author allows to the Doctor, that the Submission of the *Jews* to foreign Conquerors was lawful; for this, saith he, *was the Appointment of God.*

Remark.

Remark. ' And so was the Revolt of the ten Tribes from *Rehoboam*, upon his Threats of Tyranny.'

FROM the Old Testament, our Author follows the Doctor into the New, upon our Saviour's Resolution about paying Tribute to *Cæsar*.

From whence, he saith, the Doctor hath infer'd, that our Saviour ask'd no other Question, but who was in possession of the Government; and thereupon determin'd that Tribute should be paid him, without inquiring into his Title.

And tho our Author agrees with the Doctor, that Tribute was lawfully paid to *Cæsar*, without enquiring into his Title :

Yet (for what reason I know not) he seems to take offence at him, for mentioning the *Roman* Powers to have been gain'd by Conquest.

And tho our Author had before absolv'd the House of *York* from their Oaths to the House of *Lancaster*, as taken by fear or force :

Yet now he arraigns both Kings and Subjects for violating their Oaths and Promises, on any occasion whatsoever.

As *Francis*, the *French* King, for violating his Oaths to the Emperor (tho given under Duress in Prison;)

And King *Henry* the Eighth, for annulling his Marriage with *Ann* of *Cleves*, on pre-

G

tence

tence that he had not given an inward Consent to it.

And at last concludes his Treatise with the Text in the Prophet, denouncing God's Judgments against the *Jews*, for Violation of their Oaths to the King of *Babylon*.

Remark. ' And yet after all this, our Author would persuade the Subjects of Great Britain and Ireland to act against their Oaths; as if God had chang'd his Mind since those days, and that tho the *Jews* were to keep their Oaths to the Kings of *Babylon*, the Christians may break theirs to her Majesty, and the Protestant Succession in the House of *Hannover*.'

HAVING

HAVING thus attended and observ'd our Author thro his Treatise in his own way, I humbly crave leave of a few farther Observations in my way.

In which I'll endeavour to put my words a little closer together, than our Author hath done his ; lest I fall under the like Inconsistencies, which I have presum'd to observe in him.

Our Author hath taken a large Circumference to come at the Will of *Henry* the Eighth, made pursuant to an Act of Parliament.

And this he hath quoted as an Instance and Argument, against Limitations of the Inheritance of the Crown by Parliament :

Whereas he could not have quoted an Instance, or Argument, stronger for them.

And by the same Instance he hath also subverted his first Position, That the Kings of *England* had a Power of disposing the Crown by Will.

I presume our Author will not scruple to allow *Henry* the Eighth to have been a King Hereditary and *de jure*, and withal as apprehensive of the Powers and Prerogatives of the Crown, as any of his Predecessors.

And yet it is most evident, that this King did not think he had a Right in himself to

dispose the Crown, either by Letters Patent or Will, without Consent of both Houses of Parliament :

Else what occasion had he to procure Act of Parliament in that behalf ?

And 'tis also as evident, that he did esteem that the Inheritance and Succession of the Crown might be limited by Parliament ; else to what purpose were there two successive Acts made for that purpose ?

And from the Sequel of the History, it is also evident, that after this King's Death, the Parliamentary Settlements of the Crown made in his Reign, were held and esteemed good and effectual to those that claim'd under them, against all Pretenders to the contrary.

By the Statute of *Edward* the Sixth, *cap. 1*. all Usurpations of the Crown against the Act of 35 *Hen. 8.* are made High Treason.

And when the Duke of *Northumberland* (who had marry'd his Son to the Lady *Jane Grey*) had prevail'd upon King *Edward* the Sixth to nominate that Lady by Will for his Successor, the Judges, and other the King's Council, told him in expresse Terms, That such Designation would be of no force against the Act of Settlement ; by which the Crown (in case of King *Edward's* Death without Issue) was limited to his two Sisters, the Ladies *Mary* and *Elizabeth*.

And after his Death, Queen *Mary* and *Elizabeth* successively enjoy'd the Crown, according to that Settlement.

And tho our Author is very positive, that they had no occasion of that Act, being both legitimate Descendants of *Henry* the Eighth; yet it is plain, that King *Henry* the Eighth, and his Divines and Lawyers, in those days, were not so clear in this Point.

And after the Death of Queen *Mary* (which was conceal'd for some time) it was agreed by both Houses of Parliament, *That Queen Elizabeth should be proclaim'd, according to the Act of Settlement of 35 Hen. 8.*

And in the Act of Recognition of her Right, 1 *Eliz.* the same Act of Settlement is refer'd to.

And after that, in the 13th of her Reign, it is by another Act made High Treason, during her Life, to affirm, *That the Laws and Statutes do not bind the Right of the Crown, and the Descent, Limitation, Inheritance and Government thereof.*

But why then (perhaps would our Author say) did Queen *Elizabeth* favour the Royal Family of *Scotland*, as the next in Blood to the Crown of *England*, against this very Act of Settlement of 35 *H. 8*?

Why, who (but our Author) saith that she did?

Or if she had, her Majesty's Affection did not change the Law.

That

That the Royal Family of *Scotland* were then next in Blood to the Crown, no one can deny.

And that Queen *Elizabeth's* Inclination was, that King *James* the First should succeed her accordingly, the Histories give reason to believe.

But all this was consonant to the Act of Settlement of 35 *H. 8.* which had limited the Crown no farther than the Issue of King *Henry* the Eighth; upon failure whereof, the Crown was left to descend to his next collateral Heir (unless he should otherwise limit the same by Letters Patent, or Will.)

And there being no Claim made under any such Letters Patent, or Will, the Crown (upon the Death of Queen *Elizabeth* without Issue) came by Descent to King *James* the First, as collateral Heir to *Henry* the Eighth; and he held the same accordingly, and was so recogniz'd by Parliament, no Title appearing against him to the contrary.

For as to the pretended Will of *Henry* the Eighth, our Author tells us, it was lost or suppress'd in Queen *Mary's* Reign, fifty years before any Claim could have been made under it.

And so was all one as if never made; *De non existentibus & non apparentibus, eadem est Ratio*, say the Lawyers.

And had King *James* the First let the Throne lie vacant for above these hundred years past, till our Author had found this Will,

Will, 'tis likely the Monarchy had been con-
bounded long since.

And all the Evidence our Author hath now
offer'd of it (with which he would puzzle
the Title of two Kingdoms) would not be
admitted, in *Westminster-Hall*, for recovery of
two Acres of Land by one Subject from ano-
ther.

And what our Author hath said of it,
proves most strongly against him the very
thing he would argue from it, *viz. That the
Settlements of the Crown by Parliament are void
against the next Heir.*

He hath presented us with a Speech, pre-
par'd by Mr. *John Hales*, on behalf of the
House of *Suffolk* in 1563. (which was about
the 5th of Queen *Elizabeth*, and about seven-
teen years after the making the suppos'd Will)
in which Mr. *Hales* insisted, ' That there
' was a Settlement of the Crown by Parlia-
' ment, which the Subjects had sworn to ob-
' serve.

' And said, that if King *Henry* had made a
' Will, pursuant to the Statute, then it was
' without all doubt that the Subjects were
' bound to accept them for Kings or Queens,
' that were nam'd in it ; because, he saith, it
' was done with Consent of the whole
' Realm, confirm'd by Oaths, which being
' not contrary to God's Laws, nor the Laws
' of Nature, and being in the Subjects Power
' to observe and keep, they ought not in any
' wise

‘ wise to alter or break: for, saith he, the
 ‘ Judgment of the Lord is certain, *That he*
 ‘ *will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name*
 ‘ *in vain.*

And so he concludes, ‘ That the Act and
 ‘ Will is a Bar and Exclusion to all others, be
 ‘ they never so near of Blood (if any there
 ‘ be.’)

And then, in his Complaint of the defacing and destroying this Will, and the Record thereof, in Queen *Mary’s* Reign, he saith, ‘ It
 ‘ could be done with no other Intent, but for
 ‘ that they knew the Will to be lawful (being
 ‘ pursuant to the Act: for he saith elsewhere, that otherwise by Law the King
 ‘ could not have done it.)

Now unless some one (whom I will not name) had ow’d our Author and his People a shame, I can’t imagine whence they should have been so infatuated, as to have trump’d up such a Precedent as this, against the Limitation of the Crown by Parliament.

But Mr. *Hales*, after this, seeming to despair of producing this Will, whereby to make a Claim under it, he frames another Pretence of Title for the House of *Suffolk*, against the Heirs of the House of *Scotland*, as not born within the Allegiance of the King of *England*.

And closes his Speech with his Opinion, That the Right of the Crown (in case of Queen *Elizabeth’s* Death without Issue) was
 10

to come to *Katherine*, Daughter of *Frances*,
eldest Daughter of *Mary Queen of France*.

But besides this private Speech, our Author
hath not told us of any other Claim made by
the House of *Suffolk*.

And our Author himself elsewhere takes
notice of some Reasons against any Claim that
could be made under the Lady *Frances*, and
seems to name the Descendants of Lady *Elean-
or* (the now Earls of *Derby*) the only Per-
sons who could have claim'd under the Will,
in case they could have produc'd it.

But there is not the least footstep of History,
or spark of Evidence, in all this Story, that
any Claim, under this Will, was ever wav'd
or declin'd, or rejected or over-rul'd, as being
void or illegal against the next Heir.

And as to the Act of Recognition, 1 *Jac.*
declaring the Crown to have come to him by
inherent Birthright and lawful Succession, it is
no more or other than the Truth was; there
appearing no Parliamentary Settlement to the
contrary.

Indeed had there been, in that Act of Re-
cognition, any *Non obstante* of the Act of 35
H. 8. (which I don't find there is) our Author
had had something to say for his Hypothesis.

And as for his calling this Act of Recogni-
tion the original Contract, I never before un-
derstood a *Recognition* to be an *Original*.

But our Author knows best: And indeed I
ought not to discourage him as a new Begin-
ner,

H

ner,

ner, being the first Man of his Kidney, that I ever heard allow of any original Contract between King and People.

But, methinks, his fixing the original Contract at such a distance from the Original of the Monarchy, is something like a late Author I know, who inserted his Postscript in the middle of his Book.

After all this, our Author hath kept a *Dernier Resort*; That tho, according to the Laws of the Kingdom, the Inheritance of the Crown may be limited by Parliament, yet he would suggest that these Laws are not warranted by the Laws Divine. And saith, That whenever such Acts have been made, for diverting the Crown from the next in Blood, they have not lasted long, e'er Providence hath returned it again to the right Line.

Now this leads me to something I have said elsewhere, relating to the *Jewish Monarchy* instituted by God himself, in that compendious Charter of it deliver'd out in the Prophecy of *Jacob*:

The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Lawgiver from between his Feet, until Shiloh come.

By which the first Nomination of the Scepter fell upon *Judah*, a fourth Son, in default of his three elder Brothers.

Reuben for Incest,

And

Simeon and *Levi* for Murder.

And by the same Nomination, the Scepter was entail'd upon the Tribe of *Judah* only, whereby that became the Royal Tribe, exclusive of all the other Tribes, who, in distinction to that, were declar'd Subjects, with an Allegiance prescrib'd for them to that Tribe as their Sovereign :

*Thou art he whom thy Brethren shall praise,
by Father's Children shall bow down before thee.*

But tho, by this Entail, the Scepter was so appropriated to that Tribe, that it could not go to any of the rest, there being no collateral Entail of it to any of the other Tribes.

Yet this Entail was first general to the whole Tribe, without any special Limitation of it to any particular Family of that Tribe, or any special Issue of that Family.

And this gave every Family of that Tribe some expectancy of it, and possibility for it, till it came to be executed in the Family of *Jesse*.

Yet during this Interval, from the Nomination to the Execution of this Entail, *Judah*, upon all occasions, had the several Posts of Honour assign'd to them as the Royal Tribe.

Judah had the first of the four Standards, under which the eleven Tribes march'd and encamp'd (to cover the Tribe of *Levi*, who encompass'd the Tabernacle) in the Wilderness of *Sinai*.

And after the Death of *Joshua*, *Judah* led the Van against the rest of the unconquer'd *Canaanites* :

And so they did, after that, in the three Battels against the *Benjamites*.

But in the twelfth Generation from the Prophecy, when God came to execute this Entail in the Family of *Jesse*, he pass'd by the elder House of *Judah*, and pitch'd upon the younger for the Royal Family.

For *Jesse* was descended from *Pharez*, Son of *Judah* by a second Venter; whilst *Shelah*, the youngest Son of *Judah* by a former Venter, had a numerous Issue, which were then the elder House of *Judah*; *Er* and *Onan*, his two elder Brothers, dying without Issue.

And of this Family of *Jesse*, God again singled out *David*, the youngest Son, for the Scepter.

And thus the Scepter was divided from the Birthright, and the Birthright from the Scepter, as well in the first Creation of the Honour upon *Judah*, as in the execution of it in *David*.

And then upon *David* God entail'd again, upon him and his Issue in general:

The Lord hath sworn unto David, of the Fruit of thy Body will I set upon thy Throne.

Which was not a special Entail, always to go to the First-born, or next in Blood:

And as an Evidence of this, the first Succession of the Crown from *David* came to *Solomon* a younger Son:

And from *Solomon* there was but one Descendant, before the ten Tribes revolted, who never

never return'd again to the Crown of *Judah*, but continu'd a separate Kingdom, till they were transplanted out of *Samaria* into *Assyria*.

From whence it is evident, That tho the Constitution of this Monarchy were hereditary in general, yet the Crown was not by this confin'd or necessitated always to go to the next in Blood.

And indeed such a necessity would subvert the Nature and Intention of Government in the World.

Our Saviour hath told us, *The Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath.*

From whence is to be infer'd, *That Kings were made for the People, and not the People for Kings :*

For if God requires no Service of Man, but what is for Man's own Use and Benefit ;

How can Kings demand more of their Subjects, without arrogating to themselves something above God ?

Now the Intent of Government being for the Good of the Community, the Sovereigns are the Royal Trustees for the whole, and for that purpose are a Body Politick, invested with all the Dignities and Prerogatives of the Crown, and the Allegiance of the Subjects, to enable them to execute that Trust, and to maintain and defend them in the execution of it.

But if the Succession of this Trust and Dignity must of necessity always come to the next of

of Kin to the last Regnant (be his Capacities or Incapacities what they will) then it may so happen, that the Throne may be so fill'd, that this Trust cannot be executed, and so the Intent of Government is frustrated.

Therefore to prevent any such Accident, the Kings and Parliaments of *England* have always had the power to limit the Succession of the Crown, as they shall judg best for the Preservation of the Monarchy, and the Laws and Religion of the Kingdom.

And this is no Derogation to the Honour of the Crown, or the Rights of the Royal Family ; but for the better Preservation of themselves, and the Subjects under them.

And such Translations of the Crown are no Novelties in the *English* Monarchy.

From *Egbert*, the first *Saxon* Monarch, the Crown of *England* (subject to the *Danish* Invasions) continu'd in his Lineage, till the Invasion by the *Normans*.

But during this Continuance, it frequently happen'd, that the Brothers of the last Regnant were prefer'd to the Crown before his Sons (when Minors, and as such incapable to defend the Kingdom against foreign Invaders.)

And for that reason also *Athelstan*, tho an illegitimate Son of King *Edward* (the elder) was, by unanimous Election, made King before *Edmund*, a legitimate Son (then a Minor.)

And

And such an Incapacity our Author hath suggested of *Edgar Atheling*, the last Prince of the *Saxon* Line ; for which reason he hath justify'd the Translation of the Crown of *England* from him to *William* Duke of *Normandy*.

And for Incapacity for Government in *Robert* Duke of *Normandy*, our Author hath justify'd the Translation of the Crown from him to his younger Brothers.

But here, I perceive, our Author and I are to part, upon our Difference in two Articles :

First, By what Power the Crown may be thus translated, upon occasion.

Secondly, What is a just occasion for such Translation.

This Power of Translation of the Crown, our Author would have to be in the Kings, by themselves only, who, he saith, had antiently a Power of disposing the Crown by Will.

Now I have heard the Lawyers say, That the King cannot, by Will, dispose the Jewels of the Crown ; but that the same shall, *non obstante* such Devise, go to the Successor, in right of the Crown.

And I believe I could quote a late Case for that, where some Jewels of the Crown were adjudg'd to the Successor, against the Executor of the last Regnant.

Now either this Law, restraining the King's disposing the Jewels of the Crown, must be wrong ; or else I can't see how our Author's
Law,

Law, for the King's Disposal of the Crown it self, should be right.

And we have King *Henry* the Eighth, and the Lawyers of his days of this Opinion, That the King, by himself, could not dispose of the Crown, but by Parliament.

And, by the way, the Power given King *Henry* the Eighth, by Parliament, was not for disposing the immediate Succession of the Crown, but only a remote Contingency in it, which was not then likely to happen (tho afterwards it did happen.)

But letting our Author take his own way, that the Kings of *England* could, by Will, dispose the Crown from the next Heir ;

Why is he so much offended, That the Kings and Queens, with their Parliaments, should since do the like ?

Whoever had the Will of the King only for their Title to the Crown, our Author would have to be Kings Hereditary :

And yet whoever derive Title thereunto by the Will of King and Parliament, our Author would make Usurpers.

And so I am under the Misfortune of differing from our Author, by what Power the Crown may be translated from the next in Blood.

And for the Reasons or Causes for which the Crown may be so transfer'd, I have small hopes of any better Agreement.

Our

Our Author hath allow'd the Infancy, and other natural Incapacities in *Edgar Atheling*, good Causes for transferring the Crown of *England* from him to *William Duke of Normandy*, a Stranger in Blood to it.

And hath allow'd the Indispositions for Government in *Robert Duke of Normandy*, good Cause for taking his Dukedom from him, and him from his Dukedom.

But after this, I know he won't allow the Popish Religion any Incapacity for a Successor to a Protestant Kingdom :

And so I'll rather differ with him in Silence, than ask him the Question.

But I take liberty to think with my self, that if this be not an Incapacity, nothing else is.

Tho, I own, I never saw a Popish Successor in my Life (nor ever shall, I hope.)

But I have seen a Popish Predecessor, which shall serve me for a Looking-Glass.

And had I then been in a neighbouring Kingdom (where I have been since) I might have seen something more, of a good Man converted by his Religion to what I will not name.

Therefore they that both saw and felt the Effects of that there, may be excus'd, if they seem now a little more apprehensive than some of us on this side the Water: *The burnt Child dreads the Fire.*

I

AND

AND since our Author would make his Court to Providence, as favouring his Side, I hope I may (without Offence) observe what seems to have a favourable Aspect on our side.

This Protestant Branch of the Royal Family abroad, seems to have been, by a special Hand of Providence, preserv'd (as a Teal Tree) for ingrafting the Crown upon it.

But as the Building of the Temple of *Jerusalem*, was too great a Work to have the Honour of it confer'd upon any one Man; and therefore God first put into the Heart of *David* to frame the Model, and provide the Materials of Gold and Silver; and after him instructed *Solomon*, his Successor, to build and finish it :

So we may hope it was by the good Will of God, that his late Majesty King *William* laid the first foundation of this Succession, by establishing the Reversion of the Crown of *England* upon the Princess *Sophia*, and her Issue (being Protestants :) And closing his Life with this Action, he (like *Sampson*) became a Victor in his Death, surmounting the Glories of his Reign.

But after him, the Consummation of the Settlement seems to have been reserv'd for his
preference

resent Majesty, who accomplish'd the same by the Union of the two Kingdoms, together with this Succession.

And since that, she hath been pleas'd to express her intire Complacency and Satisfaction in so doing, in most affectionate Terms, in the Preamble of her Letters Patent, creating the Electoral Prince of *Hannover* Duke of *Cambridge*.

A Copy whereof (with an *English* Translation) is subjoin'd :

Which may animate her Subjects to recognize and avow all the share they had in it.

And to appear, the rather, the more zealous for it, because the Adversaries are so zealous against it ; as the only thing which interferes with their Projects.

And therefore they leave no Stone unturn'd at home or abroad) to seek Pretences to void it.

And finding this Settlement cemented with the Oaths and Allegiance of the Subjects, these honest Casuists are crying about their Antidote against Perjury :

(Whereof our Author, in his *Folio*, hath presented us a Specimen, call'd the *Spiritual Law* (Anglice, *Absolution by a Priest*.)

And would persuade their Patients to try the Experiment, for sake of the Cure only ; without proposing any other Advantage by the Adventure.

They would have the *Britons* and *Hybernians* turn *Galatians*, desiring again to be in Bondage; and to exchange their Religion and Liberties (which they have defended with much Blood and Treasure) for Superstition and Slavery, only in Compliment to be in the same Fashion with their Neighbours:

Inticing them to burn their own Houses and say they are in *Jest*; or that they do with an *Hereditary Intention*, on behalf of the next of Kin.

Our Author would prescribe the Right of the Crown always to descend successively to the next in Blood.

And hath threaten'd all Limitations of the Crown to the contrary, with *Anathema's* of Providence.

Now if our Author would (as an Addition to his former Labours) take the pains to spend some of his leisure Hours in visiting her Majesty's Subjects, and instructing them in relation to the Settlements of their own Estates in their private Families; and by impregnating his Principles of Hereditary Right into them, persuade them, for Conscience sake, to transform those Settlements into our Author's Model (as they will answer the contrary at their peril) then I should think he had gain'd some Profelytes.

All or most of the Estates of the Nobility and Gentry of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, as well Protestants as Papists, either have been

or are, held and enjoy'd, under Settlements made, *upon the first Son, and the Heirs Males of his Body :*

And for default of such Issue, *To the second Son, and the Heirs Males of his Body :*

And so on, to all the other Sons in Tail-Male.

Now all these Limitations over to the younger Sons, carry the Estates away from the Daughters of the elder, who, being next in Blood by Descent, are the Heirs at Common Law, and as such would have inherited the Estate, had it not been limited from them to the younger Sons :

And therefore, according to our Author's Principles of Birthright, these Translations of the Inheritances from the Daughters are wrongful, and the Inheritances ought to be restor'd to them.

Now if this be true, and that Charity and Reformation ought to begin at home, then it would be a Breach of the Golden Rule in Christianity (*to do as we would be done by*) for any Persons, holding their Estates under such Settlements, to find fault with the Settlements of the Crown by Parliament, till they had redress'd the Grievances occasion'd by such Settlements in their own Families, and restor'd their Estates to the next in Blood, to whom the Estates would have descended, if they had not been otherwise limited.

But

But whenever they please to quit their private Estates, and destroy the Settlements in their own Families, they may, with a better Grace, dispute against such like Settlements of the Crown.

But till they shall please to put this *Test* upon themselves, I can't see how they can shew their Male-content against the present Settlements thereof by Parliament, without exposing themselves to the Censure in the Gospel, *of spying a Moth in their Brother's Eye, while they keep the Beam in their own.*

Tho the Truth is (or at least I hope it is) that (unless some Sons of *Baalam* who are hir'd to curse) most of these Malecontents are either old Proprietors, or in the State of Nature; to whom, perhaps, any Change may seem rather better than their present Condition.

Nor have I said any thing with intent to get Converts among them.

But perceiving this *Folio* to have been drawn and publish'd as an Indictment against the present Settlements of the Crown, with intent (if possible) to corrupt the Minds of her Majesty's Subjects with Prejudices against them, I would not let it pass in silence, without bearing my Testimony against it.

And tho (as I said at first) I have yet Law enough on my side, to say, That whatever the late King, or her present Majesty, with

(71)

with their Parliaments, have done in this
Case, *was just, because they did it :*

Yet I rather choose to say, *They did it, be-
cause it was just.*

P R E-

PREAMBLE to the Duke of Cambridge's PATENT.

CUM serenissima domus Electoralis Brunsvico-Luneburgensis e regia Majorum nostrorum stirpe oriunda sit, & avita regna (si nos sine prole decesserimus) secundum leges auctoritate nostra sancitas, occupare debeat; cumque tamen enixe cupiamus, ut prædicta Domus serenissima non minus amicitia nobis, quam sanguine & fœderibus, devinciatur: Nos, pro singulari nostro erga illam affectu, charissimum consanguineum nostrum Geo. Augustum, serenissimi Electoris filium summis honoribus augere decrevimus. Et quamvis tanti Principis filius unicus patriis finibus excedere, sine gravi rerum periculo, non possit; his præcipue temporibus, quibus vicini Status tam violentis tempestatibus perturbantur: ut tamen rebus nostris & consiliis, qua licet, honoris & nominis auctoritate, etiam absens, quodammodo interfit, illum Parium hujus regni numero adscribi jussimus. Hæ illi erunt primitiæ supremæ istius dignitatis, ad quam (nobis, nostrisque

e
r.

of-
of-
g-
m
de-
a-
eo-
r:
tu,
uf-
zo-
nti
re,
his
am
een
&
no-
ero
su-
rif-
que

qu
le
m
r
V
is
m
gi
na
m

V

St
De
La
Ki
can
Ho
hi
con
an
Ho
uy
li
o
an

que omnibus optantibus) destinatur: ut, ornatus
 nobilissimi hujusce regni titulis, quos Re-
 gii sanguinis Principes semper ambierunt, nos-
 tratem se esse gestiat. Vos interea Barones,
 Vicecomites, Comites, Marchiones, Duces, vo-
 bis gratulemini, quod tantæ spei princeps, Ger-
 mania decus & delicia, sanctissimæ nostræ Reli-
 gionis vindex, & Libertatis publicæ propug-
 nator, vobis olim imperaturus, e vobis interim
 unus, in vestros se ordines referri amet, &c.

The same in English.

WHEREAS the most Serene Elec-
 toral House of *Brunswick-Lunen-*
burgh is sprung from the Royal
 Stock of our Ancestors, and in case of our
 Death without Issue, ought, (according to
Laws ratify'd by our Authority) to enjoy the
 Kingdoms of their Progenitors; yet as we
 earnestly desire that the said most Serene
 House should no less be ty'd to us by Friend-
 ship, than by Blood and Alliances; we, ac-
 cording to our singular Affection towards the
 same, have decreed to grace, with the highest
 Honours, our most dear Cousin, *George Au-*
gustus, Son to the most Serene Elector. And
 altho the only Son of so great a Prince cannot
 go out of his native Country without the utmost
 danger, especially at this time, when the
 K neigh-

neighbouring States are tost with such violent Tempests ; to the end nevertheless, that *as much as possible*, he may, by the Authority of his Name and Dignity, *tho absent, be in manner present in our Parliament and Councils*, we have order'd him to be added to the number of the Peers of this Realm. This will be to him an Earnest of that Supreme Dignity, to which (according to ours, and the Wishes of all our Subjects) he's destin'd, that being henceforth adorn'd with the Titles of this most noble Kingdom, which the Princes of the Blood Royal have always courted, he may be proud to be ours. You therefore the Barons, Viscounts, Earls, Marquisses, and Dukes, congratulate with your selves, that a Prince of so great Hopes, the Ornament and Darling of *Germany*, the Defender of our most Holy Religion, and the Assertor of public Liberty, one that is hereafter to govern you and till then is one of you, should now delight to be vested with the same Honours with you, &c.

N. B. That her Majesty's Recital of the House of *Brunswick-Lunenburg*'s being sprung from the Royal Stock of her Ancestors, doth include as well the late Descent of the Princess *Sophia* from King *James* the First, as the antient Descent of his Electoral Highness from King *Henry* the Second, by *Maud*, his

eldest Daughter, marry'd to *Henry*, then Duke of *Saxony*, from whom the House of *Hannover* is descended: By which that Illustrious House is of the Royal Blood of *England*, as well on the Father's as the Mother's side.

F I N I S.

BOOKS written by John Asgill Esq;

AN Argument concerning Translation. Price 1 s.
The *Jure Divino* of the House of *Hannover*. Price 6 d.

An Essay for the Press. Price 1 d.

Mr. *Asgill's* Defence on his Expulsion from the House of Commons of *Great Britain* in 1707. With an Introduction and a Postscript, relating to some Religious and Political Affairs in the Year 1712. Price 1 s.

Mr. *Asgill's* Apology for an Omission in his last Publication; containing an Extract of all the Laws for settling and securing the *Hannover* Succession. Price 3 d.

The Pretender's Declaration abstracted from two anonymous Pamphlets: the one intitled, *Jus Sacrum*; the other, *Memoirs of the Chevalier De St. George*. With *Memoirs of two other Chevaliers in the Reign of Henry the Seventh*.

THE Character of a Popish Successor, and what *Great Britain* may expect from such a one: With a new Preface. Price 6 d.

An Account of the Courts of *Prussia* and *Hannover*. Price 1 s.

A Collection of Treaties, Manifestos, Declarations of War, Renunciations, and other publick Papers, from the Reign of *Henry VII.* to the Year 1713. In two Volumes. With proper Introductions.

Pliny's Panegyrick on the Emperor *Trajan*, translated from the *Latin*. Dedicated to her Royal Highness the Princess *Sophia of Hannover*.

The Medleys for the Year 1711. To which are prefix'd the five Whig-Examiners.

